REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully sought.

The claims now presented for consideration are claims 1-22, with claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 17, and 20 being independent. Claims 1, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, and 20 have been amended herein to improve their form and to more clearly recite the present invention. Applicants submit that these amendments/additions add no new matter.

The title of the invention has been amended to attend to the Examiner's objection. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct minor defects and to generally improve its form. No new matter has been added by these changes. Favorable consideration is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,749,024 to Young. Also, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Young in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,282,050 to Ishizuka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As now recited in independent claim 1, a printing control method of controlling a printing device to output printing data onto a printing medium includes, among other features, a print setting step, a separation printing check step, a printing order check step, and a control step. In the print setting step, a separation printing setting and a printing order setting are set based on a user input to a graphical user interface. The separation printing setting represents whether a predetermined medium is output over each

printed page of the printing data and the printing order setting represents whether the printing data is output from a final page or from a first page.

In another aspect of the invention, independent claim 14 recites a printing control method including, among other features, the steps of checking printing settings including whether a plurality of different media are to be output for each page of data and which one of face-up printing and face-down printing is to be performed, and determining an output order of the plurality of different media based on which one of face-up printing and face-down printing is to be performed. The printing settings are set using a graphical interface unit before a printing operation, and are set with respect to individual print jobs.

Of the remaining independent claims, the features of claims 7 (directed to a printing control apparatus) and 13 (directed to a program stored in a storage medium) correspond generally to those of claim 1, and the features of claims 17 (directed to a printing control apparatus) and 20 (directed to computer-executable code) correspond generally to those of claim 14.

Applicants submit that many features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Young or Ishizuka et al., whether those references are taken individually, or in combination.

According to Applicants' understanding, Young teaches a printing system for printing transparency sheets with sheets of paper interleaved therebetween. Specifically, the printing system of Young automatically discerns, via a connection switch 50, whether a physically attached output module is a module 30 that stacks printed documents face-up, or a module 40 that inverts and stacks printed documents face-down. However, nowhere does Young teach or suggest (i) that a print order setting, representing

- 16 -

whether printing data is output from a final page or from a first page, is set based on a user input to a graphical user interface (claims 1, 7, and 13), or (ii) checking printing settings including which one of face-up printing and face-down printing is to be performed, wherein the printing settings are set using a graphical user interface before a printing operation (claims 14, 17, and 20).

For the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102(b) rejection of independent claims 1, 7 13, 14, 17, and 20 are respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants' do not understand Ishizuka et al. to remedy the deficiencies of the Young patent. Ishizuka et al. was cited merely for teaching saving state check means and saving function invalidating means. Nowhere does Ishizuka et al. teach or suggest that a print order setting, representing whether printing data is output from a final page or from a first page is selected based on an input to a graphical user interface (claims 1, 7, and 13), or checking printing settings including which one of face-up printing and face-down printing is to be performed, wherein the printing settings are set using a graphical user interface before a printing operation (claims 14, 17, and 20).

With further regard to Ishizuka et al., the Office Action asserts that that patent teaches the saving function invalidating means/step recited in claims 2, 3, 8, and 9. Applicants disagree. Accoring to Applicants' understanding, Ishizuka et al. may teach only turning on/off a saving function depending on the saving function settings. However, nowhere does Ishizuka et al. teach or suggest invalidating setting of a saving state when a setting of additionally outputting a predetermined medium is detected (i) in the separation printing check step (claims 2 and 3) or (ii) by the separation printing check apparatus (claims 8 and 9).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 17, and 20 and dependent claims 2, 3, 8, and 9 are patentably defined over the art cited in the Office Action. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicants further submit that, in addition to the reasons discussed above with regard to dependent claims 2, 3, 8, and 9, all of the dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims, and for reciting features further defining over the art of record. Favorable and independent consideration of each of the dependent claims are requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue are respectfully sought.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Michael J. Didas
Registration No. 55,112

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MJD/ksp
DC_MAIN 166173v1